

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

GREGORY MANEMAN et al.,

CASE NO. C24-2050-KKE

Plaintiff(s),

V.

WEYERHAUSER COMPANY et al.

**ORDER GRANTING AMERICAN
COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURERS LEAVE TO
FILE *AMICI CURIAE***

Defendant(s).

This matter comes before the Court on the American Council of Life Insurers' ("ACLI") unopposed motion for leave to file an *amici curiae* brief in support of Defendants' motions to dismiss. Dkt. No. 69. The Court previously granting ACLI leave to file an *amici curiae* brief in support of Defendants' first motions to dismiss (Dkt. No. 59) and for the same reasons, the Court grants this motion. Dkt. No. 69.

On May 29, 2025, Plaintiffs (Gregory Maneman, Annette Williams, Cassandra Wright, James Hollins, and Pierre Donaby) filed this putative class action against Defendants (Weyerhaeuser Company, Weyerhaeuser Company Annuity Committee, Weyerhaeuser Company Administrative Committee, State Street Global Advisors Trust Company, and Does 1–5) for breach of fiduciary duty and violations of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (“ERISA”), 29 U.S.C § 1001 *et seq.* Dkt. No. 62. The alleged bad acts arise from Defendants’ January 2019 transfer of certain pension obligations to a “highly risky private equity-controlled

1 insurance company with a complex and opaque structure.” *Id.* ¶ 3. On July 31, 2025, Defendants
 2 filed two motions to dismiss arguing Plaintiffs lack standing and fail to state a claim under Federal
 3 Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). Dkt. Nos. 66, 67. These motions will be fully briefed on October
 4 24, 2025. Dkt. No. 63.

5 ACLI, “the leading trade association driving public policy and advocacy on behalf of the
 6 life insurance industry[,]” seeks to file an *amici curiae* brief in support of Defendants’ motion to
 7 dismiss to provide “a broader gloss focusing on security of the life insurance industry.” Dkt. No.
 8 69 at 1, 2.

9 District courts have “broad discretion” regarding the appointment of *amici*. *Hoptowit v.*
 10 *Ray*, 682 F.2d 1237, 1260 (9th Cir. 1982), *abrogated on other grounds by Sandin v. Conner*, 515
 11 U.S. 472 (1995). Courts often welcome *amicus* briefs from non-parties “concerning legal issues
 12 that have potential ramifications beyond the parties directly involved.” *United States v. City of*
 13 *Seattle*, No. C12-1282JLR, 2023 WL 3224497, at *1 (W.D. Wash. May 3, 2023). “There are no
 14 strict prerequisites to qualify as amici and the Court will allow an *amicus* brief where, as here, the
 15 amicus has unique information that can help the court beyond the help that the lawyers for the
 16 parties are able to provide.” *Wagafe v. Biden*, No. 17-cv-00094-LK, 2022 WL 457983, at *1 (W.D.
 17 Wash. Feb. 15, 2022) (cleaned up). Further, “there is no rule that *amici* must be totally
 18 disinterested.” *Funbus Sys., Inc. v. State of Cal. Pub. Utils. Comm’n*, 801 F.2d 1120, 1125 (9th
 19 Cir. 1986) (citation omitted); *see Hoptowit*, 682 F.2d at 1260 (affirming district court’s
 20 appointment of *amicus curiae* even though *amicus* supported only one party’s arguments).

21 Here, ACLI’s proposed brief will assist the Court by providing context “about regulation
 22 of the [life and annuity insurance] industry and protections for insureds and annuitants.” Dkt. No.
 23 69 at 2. Accordingly, the motion is GRANTED. *Id.*

The Court DIRECTS the Clerk to accept for filing ACLI's proposed *amici curiae* brief (Dkt. No. 69-1). The parties may file optional responses to this brief by October 24, 2025. This order does not entitle ACLI to make a formal appearance at any hearing, participate in oral argument at any hearing, or file any reply memoranda.

Dated this 25th day of August, 2025.

Kimberly K. Eason

Kymberly K. Evanson
United States District Judge